Human Events *A Weekly Analysis for the American Citizen*
Combined with the Magazine ANALYSIS
Editorial Office 1710 Rhode Island Ave., N. W., WASHINGTON 6, D. C. *Telephone* NATIONAL 2066
VOL. VIII, NO. 35, *Issue Number* 396, AUGUST 29, 1951 ★ *Editor:* FRANK C. HANIGHEN ★ *Associate Editor:* FRANK CHODOROV

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA RECEIVED SEP 5 '51

HOW COMMUNISM IS WINNING

By Donald R. Richberg

We may think that we are gaining ground in the Cold War of tremulous diplomacy -- and perhaps in the hot war in Korea. We may hope to obstruct the physical advance of Communist imperialism in Europe and Asia. But how little will we gain out of such costly warfare if we continue losing and retreating in the war of ideas which is being waged against us?

The creed of the Communists is Socialism. Those who become converted to Socialism but are still determined to fight cruel, despotic Communists do not save their lives but are merely choosing morphine instead of a torturing poison for self-destruction. A man threatened by vicious gangsters may naturally prefer to be robbed by a polite public official who will not beat him if he does not resist. Men and women naturally would rather be robbed quietly at home, without fear of coincident murder or rape, than be assaulted brutally on a lonely highway.

The objections of Americans to Communist methods are easily understood. Until recently, however, Americans had almost as much objection to well-mannered tyrants as to the brutish kind. They asserted a God-given inalienable right to live free of all varieties of political tyranny. Yet these peculiarly hateful persons called Communists have been most successful in converting Americans -- as well as Europeans and Asiatics -- to the worst tyranny ever conceived as a political program, that is, National Socialism.

The despotic governments of the Twentieth Century have all followed the same pattern: They preach the creed of National Socialism. They use the methods which are best adapted to induce a people to accept the rule of Socialist "leaders". Neither Mussolini, nor Hitler, nor Stalin claimed a divine right or a class privilege, as did the tyrants of other centuries. Each one professed that the welfare of all the people was his objective. The State must rule all for the good of all and all must be servants of the State. The ruling class -- which always is the reality behind the abstraction of "government" -- is not a "privileged class" in the old sense. It is only "privileged" in the new sense: "privileged" to decide how everyone should live and work for the good of society,

Copyright 1951 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"privileged" to exercise absolute power over the lives of others, and hence necessarily "privileged" to have all the facilities for exercising power, which incidentally always include a great deal of what would have been called luxury and pomp in previous societies.

The quarrels between Fascists and Communists and those who called themselves "Democratic Socialists" do not arise out of profound differences of creed, but out of differences of strategy and personal ambition. Hitler and Mussolini lived for personal glory. Stalin and the Politburo conspirators are recognizable to Americans as super-gangsters.

The "Democratic Socialists" are soft-handed tyrants. They want to be liked and respected. They really believe the creed they preach. They believe that Individualism is selfishness and social irresponsibility. They believe that human beings must be compelled to work together to carry out political programs for advancing "the common good", until, in the millenium, they will all be converted to Socialism.

II

The decisive war of ideas in our time is being waged between aggressive Socialists and defensive Individualists; and in this war the Communists are winning major victories for the Socialists, even though they may denounce and be denounced by the Fascists and Democratic Socializers. The Communists proclaim "principles" of Socialism in such emotional terms as to force the other politicians to shape their programs to the same ultimate aims.

The Fascist, seeking the rule of an aristocracy of mastermen, must promise that under a strong government there will develop a disciplined citizenship that will achieve prosperity and an advance in the common welfare, impossible under the inefficiency and irresponsibility of democratic self-government.

The Democratic Socializer, seeking to use the compulsory powers of government for the "common good", must promise that by political planning and direction, the wasteful competition of private enterprise will be eliminated; that the individual will be made secure from all the risks of self-protection and self-support; and that, by accepting servitude to the State, he will serve not only his own best interests but also those of his fellow men.

Thus we have no longer a conflict over the wisdom of relying on government to advance the general welfare, but only a conflict over what form of paternal government is most desirable. The Communists must concede the replusiveness of their methods to a people who have enjoyed individual liberty, but they hold out the alluring prospect that eventually

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in a classless, equalized society there will be no social conflicts and everyone will find freedom from government controls in a voluntary dedication to public service.

III

Having thus established a perfect and peaceful society of virtuous human beings as their ultimate goal, the Communists assume a mental leadership of all mankind; because -- who should oppose their humanitarian aims, even if he is violently opposed to their immediate methods? The Communists propose to substitute State capitalism for private ownership and thereby to get rid of the evils resulting from the abuses of private money power, including the perennial menace of private monopolies. They propose a State guarantee of social security, thereby relieving the unfortunate and the incompetent from the risks of self-reliance. They propose State planning and direction of industry, thereby assuring that the common welfare, instead of individual gain, will be the objective of all industrial projects.

By this aggressive mental attack upon Individualists, the Communists have managed to force their opponents into the position of either defending selfish Individualism or else promising to remedy all the evils of Individualism by political action, which means simply a less repulsive form of State Socialism. It is a tragic misfortune that this pressure to change political thinking in the United States came just at the time when, first, a terrible depression, resulting largely from our losses in the First World War, and, second, preparation for and engaging in the Second World War, had conditioned our people to rely upon the national government to mobilize their energies and their wealth.

It may be conservatively estimated that over two-thirds of our present population was either unborn or under twenty-one years of age when the period of this reliance upon the national government began, following the crash of 1929. Only a minority of the present adult population has ever lived in a mental atmosphere of Individualism. On the contrary, a majority of the most influential members of our present society, the young and middle-aged, have been educated in their formative and mature years in an atmosphere where Socialism of one kind or another was regarded as the "wave of the future" and only reactionaries and old fogies believed in Individualism.

IV

The Communists and other socializers have made Individualism synonymous with social irresponsibility and an unbridled pursuit of selfish gain. The idea that voluntary collective action could provide the means

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for eliminating competitive wastes, and for increasing private and social security, has made little impression on popular thinking.

It would require a volume to detail how every political scheme for domestic progress or security could be more effectively and further advanced by voluntary collective action than by collective action under government compulsion. But the demonstration would be simple if once again the public mind could be opened to an understanding of the truth which inspired the men who fought for and created this nation of a free self-governing people. That truth is that government is the necessary and effective means to protect a society from internal disorder and external aggression, but it is the most dangerous and ineffective means to plan and direct the progress of a society.

Private monopolies can be destroyed by government, but government monopolies grow and spread in power until nothing less drastic than a revolt can destroy them. An all-powerful government may depend in the early stages on a free voting majority, and gather such a majority out of a coalition of favored minorities. Then we have a tyranny of majorities. But soon, fortified by the increasing dependence of large blocks of voters upon political favor, and protected by increasing legal restraints upon the freedom of any opposition, a political hierarchy will be able to compel a multitude of dissenters to support it in fear of individual losses or reprisals. Then there is an end to even the pretense of following the will of the people.

The Communists are the most aggressive, unscrupulous and successful of all the modern corrupters of public opinion. They will win until Individualism again becomes the militant faith of enough Americans, so that they will challenge all the advocates of all varieties of Socialism to an open war for the mind of the American people.

That would be a war to establish Responsible Individualism in place of Communist, Fascist or "Democratic" Socialism as our political creed. That creed expresses the political faith that was written into the Constitution of the United States; the self-reliant faith of free men in themselves and in the divine inspiration of their lives, the faith in which America has grown strong and prospered. Only by the revival of that faith can we hope to escape the spiritual and material degradation which Socialism offers to us under the false label of humanitarianism.

Quotation up to a paragraph is permitted with credit to HUMAN EVENTS. For reproduction or more extensive quotation address requests to HUMAN EVENTS, 1710 Rhode Island Avenue, N. W., Washington 6, D. C. Trial subscription, three months for $3. Six months, $5.50. One year, $10. Two years, $18. Domestic airmail (including APO and FPO) one year, $12.00; foreign (regular mail) one year, $11. Foreign airmail rates on request. Please remit in U.S.A. DOLLARS. Allow two weeks for new subscriptions or change of address to become effective.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Not Merely Gossip *A Supplement to* Human Events Vol. VIII, No. 35

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA SEP 5 '51

By Frank C. Hanighen August 29, 1951

CASE OF THE COURAGEOUS COLONEL: On the heels of the startling revelations about the murder of Major Holohan comes word that another case involving a dead American officer and the Soviet apparatus will be aired.

It is charged by the Defense Department that Holohan, a major in OSS during the war, was murdered by his aides because he refused to play the Communist game in Italy. But, it is not yet officially confirmed that a certain Colonel Michela, of Military Intelligence, was murdered by the Soviet apparatus. Now, it is rumored that the Senate Internal Security Committee, the most active body on the Hill investigating the Reds, may look into this latter mysterious affair.

It would be logical that the Internal Security group would go into this. For they are examining all relevant leads as to how we reached the present impasse in our policy in the Far East. Why did Soviet Russia enter the war against Japan at the eleventh hour -- is one important question yet to be answered. And facts are dribbling out which alter the official propaganda version.

Senator Styles Bridges lifted the hem of this curtain during the MacArthur hearings when he introduced a Military Intelligence report of 1945, which urged that Russia be kept out of the Pacific theatre. We did not need Russia's help to win, said the G-2 experts on the Far East. This document contradicted the story sedulously circulated by the State Department and gullibly swallowed by reporters -- that the Army wanted Russia to enter the war. Here is where the Courageous Colonel enters the picture.

The story related to us by sources familiar with the filing of this historic report was that the dead officer, Colonel Joseph A. Michela, played a role in this attempt to keep Russia out of the Pacific war. As relayed to us, Michela was the G-2 expert who formally presented the report and its recommendation to Chief of Staff George C. Marshall. It was quite appropriate that Michela should have performed this function since he had served in Moscow as Assistant Military Attaché and in G-2 (since 1943) as specialist on Russian affairs. After Michela emerged from his interview with Marshall, he reported the following: Marshall listened to his presentation and recommendation, shook his head and made the following remark: "It's too late. The contrary decision has already been made on a higher level."

Michela's testimony would prove highly interesting to a Senate Committee. But he was not destined to give it. In 1947, he was sent to Prague as Military Attaché, and did brilliant work. It became a byword among Intelligence circles that "Mike" had become a thorn in the side of the Soviet apparatus then taking the steps to completely dominate Czechoslovakia. He knew "too much" about the Soviet agents.

On June 12, 1949, he was found dead in a Czechoslovakian spa. The Prague dispatches said death came from natural causes. His friends in Washington wondered, for Mike was in the prime of life -- 46 years old -- and they had never known him to be ill. The body was sent to the Western zone of Germany and there was talk of an autopsy and a report. But no report came -- and then silence. But Intelligence circles here still talk of Michela's "mysterious death", and of why the Soviet apparatus might have disposed of him.

* * * * *

FORGOTTEN MEN: The Internal Security Committee last week opened up an interesting topic, when they produced evidence that Earl Browder, Secretary of the American Communist Party, in 1942 arrogantly called for the smearing of all anti-Communists in the U.S. State Department.

Copyright 1951 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Committee has shown the "importance of being pro-Communist in earnest" in its studies of the Institute of Pacific Relations. The point raised by the Browder demand suggests an inquiry into the "importance of not being in earnest against Communism", or the danger of opposing Communism as a Government employee.

The defenders of the various subversives who have been on the spot have moaned and sobbed about the Bill of Rights, the ousting of such people from Government jobs, persecution, witch-hunting, etc. But they have shed no tears over those who were made martyrs because, as Government officials, they tried to block Communist schemes of other officials who played the Communist game.

There has been some public knowledge about the smear campaigns against high-level officials, such as the late Secretary of Defense James V. Forrestal, Robert D. Murphy (now in Germany), Ambassador James C. Dunn, Ambassador Loy Henderson, etc. But, little has been revealed about scores of minor officials and employees who have suffered from the orders issued by Browder in 1942. Major Holohan was literally "rubbed out". Other "forgotten men" of this strange conflict suffered loss of jobs, and are now in private life or in some quiet estuary of Government service, where they cannot influence foreign policy.

No civil liberties organizations exist to protest their fate. They shun publicity because they have acquired a strong fear of the long arm of the Government. If in private life, they might want to get back in Government. If still in some agency, they want no "trouble". Why not? Isn't the State Department -- as the Administration claims -- now purged of subversives? Maybe, reply these unfortunates, but the same people who purged us are still there. Investigation is in order.

* * * * *

THAT JAPANESE TREATY: Senator Jenner in a penetrating speech in the Senate (August 24) attacked the Japanese peace treaty as a "booby trap" and warned that the document is actually a clever plan to destroy our security in the Pacific by "removing the beams supporting the free countries of Asia and letting them fall without letting it appear that we pulled them down".

But should we not free Japan by a treaty of peace? Yes, Jenner answered, but we must be sure we do not "set Japan free on terms which mean she will promptly fall into a trap contrived by Communist Russia and her Chinese stooges".

Jenner specifically objected to the following terms of the treaty: (1) It validates Russian possession of strategic South Sakhalin and the Kuriles; thereby breaking our island chain of bases from which our security could be threatened. (2) It ignores Free China, represented by the Nationalist Government. (3) It specifies "UN" troops for garrison in Japan; this could include Soviet troops later. (4) Japan would trade freely with Red China and the latter would, by this relationship so vital to Japan, come to infiltrate and control that country.

The Indiana Senator foresees that a free Japan will try to "play in the middle": obtain raw materials from the Chinese mainland and sell China goods, wait for Russia and the U.S. to exhaust themselves from a conflict -- and then step forward as the strongest power in Asia. But Japanese leaders, he intimated, may not sufficiently appreciate the danger of Communist infiltration and control of Japan.

Soviet Russia, according to Jenner, is playing a game of make-believe -- pretending to oppose the treaty. Actually, this tactic is merely to distract the attention of Americans away from the fact that the Japanese treaty is really quite satisfactory to Soviet Russia. A provision in Article 26 -- he points out -- permits any state which does not sign the draft treaty to conclude a bilateral treaty of peace on the same terms. "Isn't that neatly tailored to let Soviet Russia come in quietly a few months after the signing?"

Instead of the present treaty, Jenner advocates that Senators lay down the following conditions under which they will ratify a peace treaty. Such a treaty: (1) must not validate Russian claims to South Sakhalin and the Kuriles; (2) must

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

include Free China, the National Government of Chiang Kai-shek, in a settlement; (3) must reserve Japan as a base for U.S. -- not UN forces; (4) must keep Japan from making trade treaties with Red China; and (5) must offer a program of sound economic and military plans by which free nations in Asia would be strengthened.

* * * * *

SENATE ELECTIONS: We have noted that some GOP circles believe Republicans will win sufficient Senate seats in 1952 to take control of the Upper House. That sounds to us very much like cheer-leader stuff. Far more realistic is an unpublished analysis (made by a couple of Republican workers) which we have just read. This survey pictures the task of winning the Senate next year as difficult, if not impossible. The argument runs as follows:

Next year, as provided by the Constitution, 32 or one-third of the 96 Senate seats are up on the election block. Of these the Republicans now hold 19. To take over and organize the Senate, the Republicans must not only keep all their present seats, but win 3 seats now occupied by Democrats.

First, as to holding their present seats, only 7 of the 19 are regarded as safe, or reasonably safe. These are from Maine, Vermont, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Indiana, Nebraska and North Dakota. The twelve "doubtful" seats are from New York, Massachusetts, Delaware, Ohio, Minnesota, Wisconsin, Montana, Nevada, Utah, California, Washington and Missouri. Of course, some Republican Senators in this group enjoy good chances. But it must be emphasized that most of them rode in on the GOP tide of 1946, when Republican gains were above normal. It would be unrealistic to expect to hold all of these seats.

But could the GOP win sufficient seats now held by Democrats? The answer is "not likely". First of all, out of thirteen Democratic seats at stake in 1952, five are from the South, therefore automatically Democratic. Those outside the South are from Connecticut, Maryland, Arizona, New Mexico, West Virginia, Rhode Island, Michigan and Wyoming. With the exception of Michigan, none of these seats have been won by Republicans in recent Presidential years. In short, the chances of a GOP victory in next year's Senatorial elections are doubtful. Only a big GOP landslide might carry along with it Senate control. If a Republican candidate won the Presidency in a close election, he would quite probably face a Democratic Senate.

* * * * *

BAIL BONDS FOR COMMUNISTS: Since the conviction of Frederick V. Field, there has been much speculation as to whom he was protecting when he refused to divulge the names of the backers of the Civil Rights Congress. (The latter organizations bonded the four convicted Communists who jumped bail.) One of the guesses appears in the IUE-CIO News (July 30). Les Finnegan, in his column in that paper, declares that the Civil Rights Congress received support from the UE. (UE -- United Electrical Workers -- is the "splinter" organization formed by the "left wing" faction, when they were expelled by the "right wing" group now known as the IUE). There is, of course, a bitter feud between the IUE and the UE. Mr. Finnegan reports:

"The $80,000 bail, now lost forever, was put up by the Civil Rights Congress, traditionally UE's favorite Communist front . . . How much of the $80,000 came from UE is not yet definitely known, but for five years UE national officers have browbeaten local unions and districts into repeated 'contributions' to the Civil Rights Congress. When the IUE-CIO was established and took over the files and records of scores of UE locals, literally hundreds of cancelled checks were discovered proving UE support of the CRC."

There's another version than Mr. Finnegan's, among New York financial circles. According to this story, the money came from a "welfare" fund in the hands of a committee of another large trade union, in quite a different field from the UE. The employers in this field are required by the union bosses to deduct a percentage from

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

their pay rolls for this fund, for welfare work among the union members. The union committee in charge of it does not have to account to anyone for the administration of the fund. The members of this "welfare committee" are reported to be true-blue Communists. But, here is the most interesting part of this story. Mr. Frederick V. Field -- it is said -- was seeking to protect not only this union "welfare committee", but also the employers who very naturally feared the publicity that would result from disclosure of this Left Wing manipulation.

* * * * *

DEWEY EN VOYAGE: We take a tender interest in Tom Dewey, even when he's far, far away. The dispatches from Alaska say the New York Governor stopped in Anchorage on the last lap of an eight week tour, mostly in the Far East. He is due home this week. How unfortunate! The Kefauver Crime Committee has just wound up its labors, and we know how much Tom would have wanted to help them in tracing the connections of such extraordinary gentlemen as Messrs. Costello and Zwillman.

It is true, of course, that Tom became rather distrait in Albany last spring when Kefauver importunately urged him to get in on the TV show. Kefauver did not understand. He should have consulted the State Department (another deplorable instance of lack of correlation in Government). Mr. Dewey's speech-writers in that agency would have informed the Senator that Tom had become a world statesman, with a brow formidably arched in concern over global migraines.

But we understood when we caught a glimpse of him in a French dispatch from Indo-China, his arrival lyrically, Gallic-ly depicted. He came on an Army plane, accompanied by a State Department aide and several writers (not in the State Department at present). One writer was Jay Franklin, now regularly employed by the Governor (in 1948, a speech-writer for Mr. Truman).

But there was no oration in Anchorage. Perhaps, Mr. Franklin was fatigued. Perhaps, Tom recalled that Alaska hasn't the vote.

Pardon! We should get back to business and report that, surprisingly, the old Albany isolationist is now all for the State Department handling of our affairs in the East. Indeed, friends of Tom tell us that he is so impressed with our great diplomatic success in Asia, that he has changed idols. He left here several months ago lauding Eisenhower (who overlooked returning the affection); he returns telling the boys how great a man is -- Dean Acheson. (Up-state N.Y. papers please copy.)

* * * * *

BOOK FRONT: Individualist and anti-Communist books have received a fairer reception in the literary sections of metropolitan papers recently. Ever since Irene Kuhn's exposé in the American Legion Magazine last January and since Senator Owen Brewster's speech on the same subject on March 14, the change has been noticeable.

However, the New York Times Book Review apparently wants no credit for good marks and denies that it has ever shown such partiality as claimed by Mrs. Kuhn and Senator Brewster. Mr. Lester Markel, Sunday editor of the Times, wrote Brewster protesting the charges in the latter's speech. The Senator from Maine replied in a long, documented answer which reinforced his charges. Their full correspondence appeared in the August 12, Congressional Record, pages A5293-6, and offers interesting reading to those following the book controversy.

Mr. Markel asserted that Brewster's charges against the Times book section were "unfair and unfortunate and that they should be corrected". Brewster, in his rejoinder gives further supporting evidence. Brewster said: "I do not make any concessions to your charges. On the basis of the record, it seems to be very clear that some more than casual effort, some peculiar and deliberate interest was working somewhere. On the basis of the record I believe that some investigation, some heart searching and some admissions are due from the Times."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED